arXiv:1609.05320v1 [cs.CC] 17 Sep 2016

Lower bound for sensitivity of graph properties

Ilan Karpas *

Abstract

We prove that the sensitivity of any non-trivial graph property on n vertices is at least $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}n \rfloor$, provided n is sufficiently large.

1 Introduction

The notion of the *sensitivity complexity* of a boolean function (see definition in section 2), or just *sensitivity*, has been widely studied, since introduced by Cook and Dwork in [4], where it was used to derive tight lower bounds for the running time of a PRAM computing boolean function f. Simon [12] proved that if all of f's coordinates have positive influence, one has the lower bound of $s(f) = \Omega(\log n)$. This bound is known to be asymptotically tight, as demonstrated by the so called *monotone address function*.

There have been attempts to find lower bounds for the sensitivity of certain classes of boolean functions. In particular, the class of *weakly symmetric* functions has been studied. For this class, the best known lower bound is $s(f) = \Omega(\log n)$ for any non-constant weakly symmetric function f in n variables. Indeed, for weakly symmetric functions all coordinates have the same influence, from which it follows that all coordinates have positive influences if f is also non-constant, and as we have already mentioned, this guarantees $s(f) = \Omega(\log n)$.

Yet, so far, every non-constant weakly symmetric function f found, has sensitivity $s(f) = \Omega(n^{1/3})$. Turan conjectured in [15] that there exists some absolute constant $c > 0$, so that $s(f) = \Omega(n^c)$ for any non-constant weakly symmetric boolean function.

Perhaps the main open problem regarding sensitivity, is its relation to the seemingly similar notion of *block sensitivity* (see section 2 for definition). Nisan and Szegedy posed the conjecture [10] in 1994 that the two are polynomially equivalent.

This would have important implications, since block sensitivity is known to be polynomially equivalent to many important measures of the complexity of a function, including *Decision tree complexity*, *certificate complexity*, *degree* as a real polynomial, *Quantum query complexity* etc. Finding bounds on the separations between pairs of the aforementioned measures is a lively field (see, for example, [1, 2, 9, 10]). While at the moment block sensitivity can only be shown to be exponentially upper bounded by sensitivity [8], the largest known gap is quadratic, as shown first by [11]. For an excellent survey on the sensitivity conjecture, see [6].

*The Einstein Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel. Email: ilan.karpas@mail.huji.ac.il.

The sensitivity conjecture implies Turan's conjecture on weakly symmetric functions, because if f is weakly symmetric, then $bs(f) = \Omega(n^{\frac{1}{3}})$ [14].

Turan, in the same paper [15], studied the sensitivity of *graph properties*. He showed that for any non-trivial graph property f for n vertices (and so, $\binom{n}{2}$ boolean variables), $s(f) \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$. He conjectured:

Conjecture 1. [15] Let f be a non-trivial graph property for graphs with n vertices. Then $s(f) \geq n-1$.

Turan's conjecture is the best possible, since the property "G has a vertex of degree $n-1$" has sensitivity $n-1$. Wegener [16] proved $s(f) \geq n-1$ for any non-trivial *monotone* graph property f, but made no improvement on Turan's lower bound for graph properties in general. This was done only in 2011, when Sun [13] improved Turan's lower bound to $s(f) \geq \frac{6}{17}n$. In [5], lower bounds for the sensitivity of bipartite graph-properties were obtained.

Our main result in this paper, is an improvemnt of the lower bound in [13]. We prove:

Theorem 1. Let f be a non-trivial graph property on n vertices, for sufficiently large n. Then $s(f) \geq \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n \rfloor$.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2, we provide the relevant definitions and notations. The reader familiar with the topic may want to skip to subsection 2.2, where we provide non-standard definitions used in this paper. In section 3, we prove Theorem 1, and in section 4 we discuss related open problems.

2 Preliminaries and Definitions

2.1 Standard Definitions

Definition 2.1. Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be a boolean function, and $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ some point. The *sensitivity of f at point x*, which we denote as $s(f,x)$, is

$$s(f,x) := |\{i \in [n] | f(x \oplus e_i) \neq f(x)\}|.$$

In other words, it is the number of neighbours y of x in the hamming cube, with $f(y) \neq f(x)$.

The *sensitivity of f*, $s(f)$, is just the maximum sensitivity over all points:

$$s(f) = \max_x s(f,x).$$

Definition 2.2. Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be a boolean function, and $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ some point. The *block sensitivity of f at point x*, which we denote as $bs(f,x)$, is the maximum number t, such that there are t pairwise disjoint subsets of $[n]$, $B_1, \ldots, B_t$, with the property $f(x) \neq f(x^{B_i})$ for all $i \in [t]$. Here, x^{B_i} is obtained by flipping in x every coordinate $j \in B_i$.

The *block sensitivity of f*, $bs(f)$, is just the maximum block sensitivity over all points:

$$bs(f) = \max_x bs(f,x).$$

Of course $s(f) \leq bs(f)$ for every boolean function f, because each block can be a sensitive coordinate.

Definition 2.3. A group $\Gamma \leq S_n$ is called *transitive*, if for every $i, j \in [n]$, there exists an element $\pi \in \Gamma$, so that $\pi(i) = j$.

Definition 2.4. Let $x = x_1 \dots x_n$ be an n bit boolean string, and let $\pi \in S_n$ be some permutation of n elements. Then the *action* of π on x, which we denote by πx, is the string $\pi x := x_{\pi(1)} \dots x_{\pi(n)}$.

Definition 2.5. A boolean function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ is called *weakly symmetric*, if there is some transitive group $\Gamma \leq S_n$, so that for every $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ and every $\pi \in \Gamma$, $f(x) = f(\pi x)$. We say, in that case, that f is *closed under* Γ.

We now move on to discuss graph properties.
For every $\{i, j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2}$, define a suitable boolean variable $x_{\{i,j\}} \in \{0,1\}$. A string $x \in \{0,1\}^{\binom{n}{2}}$, then, can be considered simply as an assignment to all these variables. This set can also be identified with the set of all graphs with vertex set $[n]$, via the bijection

$$x \longrightarrow \Big([n], \big\{\{i,j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2} | x_{i,j} = 1\big\}\Big). \tag{1}$$

Consider the group S_n acting on the set $\binom{[n]}{2}$ in the following way: for $\{i, j\} \in \binom{[n]}{2}$, and $\pi \in S_n$, we write $\pi\{i, j\} := \{\pi(i), \pi(j)\}$. Note that S_n acts transitively on $\binom{[n]}{2}$.

Definition 2.6. $f : \{0,1\}^{\binom{[n]}{2}} \to \{0,1\}$ is called a *graph property*, if for every $\pi \in S_n$ and every point $x \in \{0,1\}^{\binom{[n]}{2}}$, $f(x) = f(\pi x)$.

By abuse of notation, from now on we shall think of the domain of f as the family of all graphs with vertex set $[n]$, using the bijection in (1). f being a graph property, in this notation, means that $f(G) = f(H)$ whenever G and H are isomorphic graphs. Furthermore, we will sometimes think of a graph simply as its set of edges, so for example $|G|$ will denote the number of edges in G. This should not create confusion, since the vertex set is always understood to be $[n]$, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

2.2 non-standard Definitions and notations

Throughout this subsection, f is a non-trivial graph property on graphs with vertex set $[n]$, and $f(\overline{K_n}) = 0$.

Definition 2.7. For a graph $G = ([n], E)$, $G \neq \overline{K_n}$, we define the *positive minimum degree* of G, denoted by $\delta'(G)$, to be the minimum degree of any non-isolated vertex in G. We write $\delta'(\overline{K_n}) = \infty$. For any natural number k, we denote by $G_{[k]}$ the maximal subgraph of G (with vertex set $[n]$), for which $\delta'(G_{[k]}) \geq k$.
Observe that if $\delta'(G) \geq k$, then $G_{[k]} = G$. Otherwise $G_{[k]} \subsetneq G$.

Definition 2.8. Any graph G can have three kinds of connected components: isolated vertices, components containing a cycle, and trees containing at least one edge. We define the *positive minimum tree component size*, which we denote by $c(G)$, to be the number of edges in the smallest connected

component of G that is a tree, **but not an isolated vertex**. If G has no connected components of this form, we write $c(G) = \infty$.

For any natural number k, we denote by $G_{(k)}$ the maximal subgraph of G (with vertex set $[n]$), so that $c(G_{(k)}) \geq k$.
Observe that if $c(G) \geq k$, then $G_{(k)} = G$. Otherwise $G_{(k)} \subsetneq G$.

Definition 2.9. We call a graph G *minimal* with respect to f, if $f(G) = 1$ and $f(G') = 0$ for every graph $G' \subsetneq G$. The set of all minimal graphs for f is denoted by $m(f)$. Notice that $m(f) \neq \emptyset$ because we took f to be non-trivial.

We write $\delta'(f) = \min_{G \in m(f)} \delta'(G)$, and $c(f) = \min_{G \in m(f)} c(G)$.

Definition 2.10. Let T be a tree with k edges. A *tree construction sequence of* T, is a sequence of k trees $T^{(1)}, \ldots, T^{(k)}$ such that:

- For every $i \in [k]$, $T^{(i)}$ is a tree with i edges.
- $T^{(k)}$ is isomorphic to T.
- For every $i \in [k-1]$, $T^{(i+1)}$ is obtained from $T^{(i)}$ by adding a new vertex, and connecting this vertex by an edge to some other vertex in $T^{(i)}$.

(See Figure 1).



Figure 1: Tree construction sequence

3 proof of main theorem

Before proving the main theorem, we need the following lemma, found in [13]

Lemma 3.1. Let f be a graph property, and G be a graph. Let $v \in V(G)$ be a vertex of degree one, and $e = \{v, u\}$ the unique edge in G where v occurs. Then either $s(f) \geq |I(G)|+1$, or $f(G) = f(G \setminus e)$.

Proof. Let f, G, v, e be as in the statement of the lemma. Assume that $f(G) \neq f(G \setminus e)$, and let $I(G) = \{w_1, \ldots, w_{|I(G)|}\}$. Observe that G is isomorphic to $(G \setminus e) \cup \{u, w_i\}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq |I(G)|$. Thus, $f(G) = f((G \setminus e) \cup \{u, w_i\})$ for every $w_i \in I(G)$. But this means that $f(G \setminus e) \neq f((G \setminus e) \cup \{u, w_i\})$, and as mentioned, $f(G \setminus e) \neq f(G)$. So the sensitivity of f at $G \setminus e$ is at least $|I(G)|+1$, as claimed. $\square$

proof of Theorem 1. Throughout the proof, we assume that all graphs have vertex set $[n]$. Assume without loss of generality that for the graph with no edges $\overline{K_n}$, $f(\overline{K_n}) = 0$, and assume by contradiction that $s(f) < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.

It is an easy, but important, observation, that if $G \in m(f)$ then G is sensitive at any of the edges it contains, which means that

$$|G| \leq s(f, G) < \lfloor \frac{1}{2} n \rfloor \tag{2}$$

As already mentioned, by our assumptions on f, $c(f)$ and $\delta'(f)$ are well defined. We divide our proof to three cases, based on their possible values:

Case 1 ($\delta'(f) \geq 2$)

Let $G \in m(f)$, $\delta'(G) = \delta'(f)$. In this case, since there are no vertices of degree one in G, in particular any connected component which is not an isolated vertex, can not be a tree. Thus, for every connected component in G, the number of edges in that component is at least the number of vertices in it. Summing over all connected components, produces the inequality

$$|G| + |I(G)| \geq n. \tag{3}$$

Combining this with (2)

$$|I(G)| > \frac{1}{2} n \tag{4}$$

We show an algorithm that finds a graph $G' \subsetneq G$, with $f(G') = 1$. But we took $G \in m(f)$, which is a contradiction. Denote the isolated vertices of G by $I(G) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for $\delta'(f) \geq 2$

$H \leftarrow G$
$k \leftarrow \delta'(G)$
$m \leftarrow |I(G)|$
Find a vertex v of degree k. Denote $N(v) = \{u, u_1, \ldots, u_{k-1}\}$
for $i := 1$ to $k-1$ **do**
  for $j := 1$ to m **do**
    if $\exists e \in G$ so that $f(H \setminus e) = f(H)$ **then**
      $H \leftarrow H \setminus e$
      return some minimal graph $G' \subset H$ {We prove that such G' must exist}
    end if
    $H \leftarrow H \cup \{u_i, v_j\}$
  end for
end for
$H \leftarrow H \setminus \{v, u\}$
return some minimal graph $G' \subset H$ { We prove that such G' must exist}

Claim 1. At any stage in the algorithm, $f(H) = 1$. Thus $f(G') = 1$.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that this is not the case. Then there must be a first time during the execution of the algorithm when the value of $f(H)$ becomes zero. When we refer to H in the proof, henceforth, we mean the graph H in the algorithm immediately after its value becomes zero for the first time. This can occur either during some iteration of the for-loop, or at the end of the loop, while removing edge $\{v, u\}$.

We deal with the latter case first: Let $H^+ = H \cup \{v, u\}$. That is, the graph in the algorithm just before removing edge $\{v, u\}$. By our assumption $f(H^+) = 1$. But notice that $H \cup \{v_i, u\}$ is isomorphic to H^+, for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Thus, H is sensitive at all these edges, and at $\{v, u\}$, which means that $s(f, H) \geq m + 1 > \frac{1}{2}n$, contradicting (4) (see Figure 2a).

Next, we deal with the case that the value of $f(H)$ becomes zero for the first time during some iteration of the for-loop. This can not happen inside the if-condition, because the algorithm only removes edge e inside the if-condition if guaranteed that removing it would not change the value of the function f. Hence, it could only happen when adding edge $\{u_i, v_j\}$, for some $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Denote by $H^- = H \setminus \{u_i, v_j\}$ the graph just before adding this edge. Since the if-condition for H^- did not hold, H^- is sensitive at every edge contained in G. Furthermore, H is isomorphic to $H^- \cup \{u_i, v_l\}$ for every $j \leq l \leq m$. That is, H^- is also sensitive on any of these $m - j + 1$ edges. Together, we see that

$$m - j + 1 + |G| \leq s(f, H^-) \leq s(f) < \frac{1}{2}n. \tag{5}$$

Now let's turn our attention to H itself. We know that $f(H) \neq f(H^-)$, and that H^- is isomorphic to

$H \setminus \{u_i, v_l\}$ for any $1 \leq l \leq j$. That is, H is sensitive on all these edges. So

$$j \leq s(f, H) < \frac{1}{2}n. \tag{6}$$

Taking (5)+(6) gives $m + |G| + 1 < n$, which is a contradiction to (3) (see Figure 2b). So $f(H) = 1$, and since G' is a minimal graph contained in H, by definition $f(G') = 1$. □

Claim 2. $G' \subsetneq G$.

Proof. Since $\delta'(G) = k$, we know that $G_{[k]} = G$ (see Definition 2.7). On the otherhand, at each stage the algorithm adds to H only edges to vertices in $I(G)$. However, for every such vertex $v_i \in I(H)$, the degree of v_i **in H** remains strictly smaller than k throughout the execution of the algorithm, which means that throughout the execution of the algorithm $H_{[k]} \subseteq G$. Finally, the algorithm removes an edge from H that belongs to G, either inside the if-condition or after the for-loop. After this happens, no more changes to H are made, and at this point $H_{[k]} \subsetneq G$. From the previous claim, $f(H) = 1$. Since G' is a minimal graph, by our assumption $\delta'(G') \geq k$. Thus, $G' = G'_{[k]} \subseteq H_{[k]} \subsetneq G$, proving the claim. □



(a) $f(H)$ changes outside loop



(b) $f(H)$ changes inside loop

Figure 2: Example with $\delta'(G) = 3$. Black lines are edges, thick black lines are sensitive edges, red lines are sensitive non-edges.

Case 2 ($\delta'(G) = 1$, $c(G) \geq 2$)

Let $G \in m(f)$ be a graph so that $\delta'(G) = 1$, $c(G) = c(f)$. Denote by $T_1, \ldots, T_r$ the connected components of G that are trees but non isolated edges, by $C_1, \ldots, C_l$ the connected components that are non-trees, and by $I(G) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$ the set of isolated vertices. We do not assume a-priori that $c(G) < \infty$, that is, that G has any components of the form T_i. However, we soon prove that this is indeed the case.

Notice, that for each component T_i the number of edges in T_i is exactly one less than the number of vertices in it, and for each component C_i the number of edges in C_i is at least the number of vertices in it. Summing over all components, we obtain

$$|I(G)| + |G| \geq n - r. \tag{7}$$

We show that $r \geq 3$. Since G is minimal, and $\delta'(G) = 1$, by Lemma 3.1 $|I(G)| \leq s(f) - 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}n - 2$. Yet, from that same minimality, G is sensitive at every edge it contains, therefore $|G| \leq s(f, G) \leq s(f) \leq \frac{1}{2}n - 1$. Adding the two, we deduce $|I(G)| + |G| \leq n - 3$, and so $r \geq 3$ by (7).

From the pigeonhole principle and the minimality of G,

$$c(G) \leq |G|/r < \frac{1}{2r}n. \tag{8}$$

In this particular case, we also assume $c(G) \geq 2$, so combined with (8) this implies $r < \frac{1}{4}n$.

We provide an algorithm which has as input a minimal graph G with the properties described above, and outputs a graph $G' \subseteq G$, $f(G') = 1$, which is a contradcition to the minimality of G. Recall, the set of isolated edges of G is $I(G) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$.

Algorithm 2 Algorithm for $\delta'(f) = 1$, $c(f) \geq 2$

$H \leftarrow G$
Find some tree component $T = (V_T, E_T)$ of G with $c(G) = |E(T)|$, and some construction sequence $T^{(1)}, \ldots, T^{(c(G))}$ of T.
for $i := 1 \rightarrow c(G) - 1$ **do**
  if $\exists e \in G$ so that $f(H \setminus e) = f(H)$ **then**
    $H \leftarrow H \setminus e$
    return some minimal graph $G' \subset H$ {We prove that such G' must exist}
  end if
  connect vertex v_{i+1} to some vertex v_j, $1 \leq j \leq i$, so that the subgraph of H induced on vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{i+1}$ will be isomorphic to $T^{(i)}$.
end for
Remove from H some edge $e = \{u, v\}$ in component T, so that $(V_T \setminus \{u\}, E_T \setminus \{e\})$ is isomorphic to $T^{(c(G)-1)}$.
return some minimal graph $G' \subset H$ {We prove that such G' must exist}

Claim 3. At each stage in the algorithm $f(H)$=1. Thus, $f(G')$=1.

Proof. Assume that at some stage in the algorithm $f(H) = 0$, and let us take the first time that this happens. This stage can either occur inside the for-loop, or after the for-loop, while removing edge $e = \{u, v\}$. Assume the former. The value of $f(H)$ can not change inside the if-condition, because the if-condition only holds if edge e could be removed from H without changing the value of f in H.

From this it follows that the change occurs at some iteration, i, when adding the edge $\{v_{i+1}, v_j\}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq i$. Denote by $H^- = H \setminus \{v_{i+1}, v_j\}$ the graph just before this edge was removed. $f(H^-) = 1$. Furthermore, no edge $e \in G$ could be removed from H^- without changing the value of the function, otherwise the if-condition in the beginning of the ith iteration would hold. Hence, H^- is sensitive on all $|G|$ edges that belong to G. In addition to that, H is isomorphic to $H^- \cup \{v_j, v_l\}$ for every $i + 1 \leq l \leq m$. Thus, adding any one of these edges to H^- changes the value of f on the graph. Together, we see that
$s(f) \geq s(f, H^-) \geq m - i + |G| \geq m - c(G) + 1 + |G|$. From (7) and our assumption $s(f) \leq \frac{1}{2}n - 1$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}n \geq n - r - c(G) + 2, \tag{9}$$

and recalling (8), we deduce

$$\frac{1}{2}n + 2 < r + \frac{n}{2r}. \tag{10}$$

This inequality does not hold for any $3 \leq r \leq n/4$, and n sufficiently large.

Next, assume that $f(H)$ becomes zero for the first time after the loop, while removing edge $\{u, v\}$. Denote by $H^+ = H \cup \{u, v\}$, the graph just before removing edge $\{u, v\}$ and changing the value of the function. The following facts are of importance to us:

- H contains two connected components, which are isomorphic to $T^{(c(G))-1}$. Namely, one copy on vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{c(G)}$ with edges added by the algorithm, and one copy formed from T by removing edge $\{u, v\}$. Call these copies T_1 and T_2, respectively.
- $I(H) = \{v_{c(G)+1}, \ldots, v_m, u\}$, so
$$|I(H)| = m - c(G) + 1. \tag{11}$$

The graph H^+ is isomorphic to any graph of the form $H \cup \{v, w\}$, $w \in I(H)$. Additionally, there is some vertex $v_j \in V(T_1)$, $1 \leq j \leq c(G)$, so that for any $w \in I(H)$, $H \cup \{v_j, w\}$ is isomorphic to H^+. This is true, because T_1 and T_2 are isomorphic. From all of the above, it follows that $\frac{1}{2}n > s(f, H) \geq 2|I(H)|$. With (8) and (11), this implies

$$\frac{1}{2}n > 2(m - c(G) + 1) \geq 2(m - |G|/r + 1) \tag{12}$$

From equation (7), we know that $m \geq n - |G| - r$. Plugging this into (12), using $|G| \leq \frac{1}{2}n - 1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{4}n > n - r - (\frac{1}{2}n - 1)(1 + \frac{1}{r}) + 1. \tag{13}$$

Reogranizing, using $r \geq 3$:

$$r - 2 > \frac{1}{4}n(1 - \frac{1}{2r}), \tag{14}$$

or

$$r > n/4, \tag{15}$$

which we have shown is impossible. Thus, at every stage of the algorithm $f(H) = 1$ (see Figure 3), and consequentially $f(G') = 1$. □

Claim 4. $G' \subsetneq G$

Proof. Let $c(G) = k$. Notice that throughout the algorithm, $H_{(k)} \subseteq G = G_{(k)}$, because all edges which are in $H \setminus G$ form a tree component in H with less than k edges. The last change the algorithm does to H, is removing an edge from H that is also an edge of G. Thus, after this edge is removed and the algorithm does not change H anymore, it is the case that $H_{(k)} \subsetneq G$, hence also $G'_{(k)} \subsetneq G$. Recall our choice of G: $G \in m(f)$ and $k = c(G) = c(f)$. $G' \in m(f)$ as well, so of course $c(G') \geq c(f) = k$, and therefore $G' = G'_{(k)} \subsetneq G$, proving the claim □



Figure 3: Example with $c(G) = 7$, $f(H)$ changes outside loop. Black lines are edges, thick black lines are sensitive edges, red lines are sensitive non-edges.

Case 3 ($c(f) = 1$)

Choose a graph $G \in m(f)$, so that $\delta'(G) = 1$, $c(G) = 1$. Let $E_1, \ldots, E_m$ be its connected components with one edge, $C_1, \ldots, C_l$ the connected components with at least 2 edges, and $I(G) = \{w_1, \ldots, w_r\}$ the set of isolated vertices. The following structural lemma will be useful:

Lemma 3.2. For the graph G above:

1. $r \geq 2$
2. $r = o(n)$
3. $m = \frac{1}{2}n - o(n)$ and $l = o(n)$

Proof. 1. Since G is minimal, $|G| \leq s(f, G) \leq \frac{1}{2}n - 1$. In any graph, the number of non-isolated vertices is at most twice the number of edges. Thus, $r \geq n - 2|G| \geq n - (n-2) = 2$.

2. Let $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ be an edge which connects two vertices of degree one. Remove this edge, to obtain graph $G^- = G \setminus \{u, v\}$. By minimality of G, $f(G^-) \neq f(G)$. $|I(G^-)| = r + 2$, and adding any edge between two isolated vertices in G^- will create a graph isomorphic to G, and thus change the value of the function. Thus, $\binom{r+2}{2} \leq s(f, G^-) \leq s(f) \leq \frac{1}{2}n$, so $r = o(n)$.

3. Notice, that for each component E_i, $i \in [m]$, there are exactly two vertices in the component. Thus, the total number of vertices in these components is $2m$. For any component C_i, $i \in [l]$, $|V(C_i)| \leq |C_i| + 1 \leq \frac{3}{2}|C_i|$, because $|C_i| \geq 2$. So we can write the following inequalites:

$$\frac{1}{2}n - 1 \geq |G| = m + \sum_{i=1}^{l} |C_i| \tag{16}$$

$$n = r + 2m + \sum_{i=1}^{l} (|C_i| + 1) \geq o(n) + 2m + \frac{3}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{l} |C_i|. \tag{17}$$

taking $4 \cdot (16) - 2 \cdot (17)$, we obtain
$\sum_{i=1}^{l} |C_i| = o(n)$, and thus $m = \frac{1}{2}n - o(n)$, proving 3.

□

Our method of proof will be to obtain two isomorphic graphs H and H', for which $f(H) \neq f(H')$, which is impossible since f is a graph property. Let $E_i = \{v_i, u_i\}$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$. We define $H = G \cup \{u_1, u_2\} \cup (\bigcup_{i=3}^{\lceil n/6 \rceil + 1} \{v_1, v_i\}$. Next, we define $H' = H \cup \{v_1, v_2\} \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}$. Notice, that H' is isomorphic to H, since the function $\pi : V(H') \to V(H)$ given by $\pi(v_2) = u_1$, $\pi(u_1) = v_2$, $\pi(x) = x$ for all $x \in V \setminus \{v_2, u_1\}$ is a graph isomorphism. So to finish the proof, we just need to prove $f(H) \neq f(H')$.

Claim 5. $f(H) = 1$.

Proof. Construct H from G in the following way. First, add edge $\{u_1, u_2\}$, and then add the edges $\{v_1, v_i\}$ one by one, starting from $i = 3$ and increasing i by one each time. In this way we obtain a sequence of graphs $G := G_1, G_2, G_3, \ldots, G_{\lceil n/6 \rceil + 1} = H$, so that $G_2 = G \cup \{u_1, u_2\}$, and for $3 \leq i \leq \lceil n/6 \rceil + 1$, $G_i = G_{i-1} \cup \{v_1, v_i\}$.
Notice that G_2 is isomorphic to $G \cup \{u_i, u_j\}$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, and so if G was sensitive for $\{u_1, u_2\}$ it would be sensitive for $\Omega(m^2) = \Omega(n^2)$ edges, which is impossible for sufficiently large n.

So $f(G_1) = 1$. Assume that G_i is the first graph in the sequence for which $f(G_i) = 0$, for some $3 \leq i \leq \lceil n/6 \rceil + 1$. That is, G_{i-1} is sensitive on edge $\{v_1, v_i\}$.

However, all graphs of the form $G_{i-1} \cup \{v_1, v_j\}$ and $G_{i-1} \cup \{v_1, u_j\}$ are isomorphic to G_i, for $i \leq j \leq m$. Hence, $s(f, G_{i-1}) \geq 2(m - i + 1) \geq 2(m - \lceil n/6 \rceil) = \frac{2}{3}n - o(n) > \frac{1}{2}n$, for sufficiently large n. This contradicts our assumption $s(f) \leq \frac{1}{2}n - 1$. Hence, $f(H) = f(G) = 1$. □

Claim 6. $f(H') = 0$.

Proof. Since G is minimal, $f(G \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}) = 0$. Denote by $G' = G \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}$. $u_1, v_1 \in I(G')$, because they both belong to E_1 in G. Thus, $|I(G')| = r + 2 \geq 4$, from 1 in lemma 3.2. Construct H' from G', by first adding edges $\{v_1, v_i\}$ one by one, starting from $i = 2$ and increasing i by one each time. Finally, add the edge $\{u_1, u_2\}$.

In this way we obtain a sequence of graphs $G' := G'_1, G'_2, \ldots, G'_{\lceil n/6 \rceil + 1}, H'$, so that $G'_i = G'_{i-1} \cup \{v_1, v_i\}$ for every $2 \leq i \leq \lceil n/6 \rceil + 1$, and $H = G'_{\lceil n/6 \rceil + 1} \cup \{u_1, u_2\}$. From identical consideration as in the previous claim, $f(G_i) = f(G_{i-1}) = 0$ for all $2 \leq i \leq \lceil n/6 \rceil + 1$, since otherwise G_{i-1} would be sensitive for too many edges.

Thus, we just need to prove $f(H') = f(G_{\lceil n/6 \rceil + 1})$. Denote by $H'^{-} = G'_{\lceil n/6 \rceil + 1}$. the only vertex that is isolated in G' but not in H'^{-} is v_1. So let $u_1, w_1, w_2 \in I(H'^{-})$. Notice that H' is isomorphic to all graphs of the form $H'^{-} \cup \{u_1, u_j\}$, $H'^{-} \cup \{w_1, u_j\}$, $H'^{-} \cup \{w_2, u_j\}$, for $2 \leq j \leq \lceil n/6 \rceil + 1$. This makes a total of $3\lceil n/6 \rceil > \frac{1}{2}n - 1 \geq s(f)$, so if $f(H'^{-}) \neq f(H')$, then $s(f, H'^{-}) > s(f)$, which is impossible. Hence, $f(H') = 0$, proving the claim. □

□

4 Concluding Remarks

Conjecture 1 remains unresolved, more than thirty years after it was first formulated. This author remains agnostic about the veracity of the conjecture.

One can of course ask an analogous question for k-uniform hypergraphs for any fixed integer $k \geq 2$. That is, is the minimum sensitivity for any non-trivial k-uniform hypergraph property the same as the minimum sensitivity for any non-trivial **monotone** k-uniform hypergraph property. It turns out, though, that for $k > 2$ this is false, even asymptotically.

Indeed, it is well known, and not hard to see, that if f is a non-trivial monotone k-uniform hypergraph property, then $s(f) = \Omega(n^{k/2})$. On the other hand, in a paper recently uploaded to arxiv, Li and Sun [7] show that for any $k \geq 2$, there exists a non-trivial k-uniform hypergraph property so that

$$s(f) = O(n^{\lceil k/3 \rceil}), \tag{18}$$

and if $k \equiv 1 (\text{mod } 3)$, this bound can be improved to

$$s(f) = O(n^{\lceil k/3 \rceil - 1/2}). \tag{19}$$

Regardless, bounds for the sensitivity of k-uniform hypergraph properties remain of interest, both for the monotone and for the general case.

Finally, we propose a weaker form of Conjecture 1, where we limit f to be a non-trivial *min-term* graph property. See [3] for the definition of a min-term function.

Conjecture 2. Let $f : \{0,1\}^{\binom{n}{2}} \to \{0,1\}$ be a non-trivial *min-term* graph property. Then

$$s(f) \geq n - 1.$$

References

[1] A. Ambainis: Polynomial degree vs. quantum query complexity, *J. of Computer and Systems Sciences*, **72**(2) (2006), 220-238.

[2] R. Beals, H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, M. Mosca and R. De Wolf: Quantum lower bounds by polynomials, *J. ACM*, **48**(4) (2001), pages 778-797.

[3] S. Chakraborty: On the Sensitivity of Cyclically-Invariant Boolean Functions, **CCC 2005**, pages 163-167.

[4] S. Cook and C. Dwork: Bounds on the time for parallel RAM's to compute simple functions, **STOC 1982**, pages 231-233.

[5] Y. Gao, J. Mao, X. Sun and S. Zuo: On the sensitivity complexity of bipartite graph properties, *Theoretical Computer Science* **468** (2013), 83-91.

[6] P. Hatami, R. Kulkarni and D. Pankratov: Variations on the sensitivity conjecture, *Theory of Computing, Graduate Surveys***4** (2011), 1-27

[7] Q. Li and X. Sun: On the Sensitivity Complexity of k-Uniform Hypergraph Properties, `https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.06724` (2016), 15 pages.

[8] C. Kenyon and S. Kutin: Sensitivity, block sensitivity and l-block sensitivity of boolean functions, *Information and Computation* **189** *http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.02242*.

[9] N. Nisan: CREW PRAMs and decision trees, *1989 STOC*,(1997), 327-335.

[10] N. Nisan and M. Szegedy: On the degree of Boolean functions as real polynomials, *Computational Complexity* **4**(4) (1994), pages 301-313.

[11] D. Rubinstein: Sensitivity vs. block sensitivity of Boolean functions, **Combinatorica**, **4**(2) (1995), 297-299.

[12] H. Simon: A Tight $\Omega(loglogn)$-Bound on the Time for Parallel Ram's to Compute Nondegenerated Boolean Functions, **FCT 1983**, pages 439-444.

[13] X. Sun: An improved lower bound on the sensitivity complexity of graph properties, *Theoretical Computer Science* **412**(29)(2011), 3524-3529.

[14] X. Sun: Block sensitivity of weakly symmetric functions, *Theoretical Computer Science*, **384**(1) (2007), 87-91.

[15] Gy. Turan: The critical complexity of graph properties, **Inforamtion Processing Letters 18**(3) (1984), 151-153.

[16] I. Wegener: The critical complexity of all (monotone) Boolean functions and monotone graph properties, **FCT 1985**, pages 494-502.